

treated. The Central Committee were charged to keep it floating until the great battle of reform, in which the Whigs are now engaged, was fought and won, and as a monument of the important trust reposed by the Whig Young Men of Missouri in the hands of their Central Committee.

Mr. T. Miller, of Boone, received it on behalf of the committee, in a few appropriate remarks, in which he stated that it had passed into the hands of Whigs as warm and true as the State furnished, and pledged the necessary and untiring exertions of the Central Committee in their endeavors to carry out, in spirit and in letter, the trust reposed in them by the Whig Young Men of the State. Never should it be lowered or cease to wave until the great battle was fought and won. Organization and activity on the part of the young men of the State, should henceforth be the aim of the Central Committee.

On motion, the thanks of the meeting were tendered to Col. O'Fallon, of St. Louis, for the amiable and polite manner in which he had discharged the duties of President of the Old Soldiers' Convention.

As the Colonel was leaving the stand, three hearty cheers were given for the Aid-de-Camp of General Harrison.

On further motion, the thanks of the Convention were tendered to Judge Tonn, of Boone, for the efficient and gentlemanly manner in which he had discharged the duties of President of the Convention.

The Convention then adjourned.

After the adjournment, on the river bank, in the presence of the assembled crowd, Mr. James Aull, on behalf of the Lafayette delegation, presented to the St. Louis delegation, the banner born by that delegation, accompanied with a few appropriate remarks as to the object of the donation.

In return, the St. Louis delegation presented through Mr. Chambers, the flag born by the Civil War delegation, and a number of boxes of hard cider, accompanied by some remarks.

From the Spirit of '76.

TERRITORIAL FREEHOLD QUALIFICATION.

Amongst the numerous bugbears got up by the Van Buren leaders with which to frighten the community, none has been relied upon more than the charge that General Harrison, while Governor of the Indiana territory, approved a law requiring a freehold qualification for voters. We fully explained, sometime since, the nature of this law, and the necessity which arose for its passage, and if the Van Buren editors had been honest enough to have published the preamble which precedes the garbled section which they quote, that alone would have set the matter at rest. But forgeries, garbled extracts, and slanders are now chiefly relied upon by such men to sustain their sinking cause; and to be consistent they gave to the world the law of 1807, without the preamble which states expressly that the law was passed for the purpose of explaining the meaning of the act of Congress of 1800 for the Government of the Indiana territory, which required a freehold of fifty acres of land as a qualification for voters.

Robert Dale Owen, who makes some pretensions as an honorable politician, had the meanness to get up in presence of an assemblage of intelligent men, and read the section of the law precisely in the manner in which it had appeared in the Van Buren papers. He knew very well that neither the Territorial legislature nor Governor Harrison had the right to require any such provision; he knew full well the object of the law, had the whole of it before him, and could have read the preamble as well as not; and he should have left the contemptible business of imitating loco-foco newspaper to such creatures as William J. Peaslee, whose calibre is of the right mould, and whose character could not be affected by any additional dirty work which might be imposed on him.

Some of the Van Buren editors too, finding they were detected in their frauds have since asserted that the Territorial Legislature were not bound by the ordinance and act of Congress, but had the privilege of granting universal suffrage. Such editors, if they make the assertion through ignorance, are certainly very capable of enlightening the public; if through knavery, they ought certainly to expect that every thing they say will be believed. Such men are either fools or knaves, and they may take either horn of the dilemma they choose.

But our object is to show that Congress was not satisfied with the liberal construction put upon the ordinance by the Territorial Legislature of 1807, and in order to settle the question they passed the following law, which may be found on page 54, Laws of the United States, vol. 9.

An act extending the right of suffrage in the Indiana Territory.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That every free white male person in the Indiana Territory, above the age of twenty-one years, having been a citizen of the United States, & resident in the said territory, one year next preceding an election of representatives, and who has a legal or equitable title to a TRACT OF LAND OF THE QUANTITY OF FIFTY ACRES, or who may become the purchaser of such tract, or who may become the purchaser of a TRACT OF LAND OF THE QUANTITY OF FIFTY ACRES, or who holds in his own right a town lot of the value of ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS, shall be entitled to vote for representatives to the general assembly of the said territory.

J. B. VARNUM,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
GEO. CLINTON,
Vice-President of the United States,
and President of the Senate.

February 26, 1808.

APPROVED,
TH. JEFFERSON.

Here then is the repetition of the freehold qualification. By whom was this required? By Gen. Harrison or by Congress? By whom was this FIFTY ACRES and HUNDRED DOLLAR LAW APPROVED? By Gen. Harrison or by THOMAS JEFFERSON? We think that our Secretary of State should now get himself into better business than copying old Territorial Laws and affixing the big seal, to be scattered all over this State and Ohio; and whenever Robert Dale Owen and William L. Peaslee again allude to the subject, we hope some honest farmer will rise in the crowd, refer to the law which we have published and ask who is THOMAS JEFFERSON.

VERY DEMOCRATIC.—Another Festival is to be held at Rocheport on the 4th instant, for Democrats "party" Democrats ALONE! Such is the representation of the recent hospitality of the Whigs. We understand invitations have been tendered and accepted amongst the office-holders here, and the elite at Franklin and other places. Such is modern democracy and such is party patriotism. The friends of the soldier and statesman who "fought many battles in the 2d war for Independence than any other American General, and was never defeated"—the friends of this man are excluded from the celebration of the anniversary perpetuated—and this in the name of Democracy (!) and by Democratic leaders! Did ever bigotry, on the one hand, and a dread of truth on the other, go farther than in this!—Stockholder.

POLITICAL CHANGES.

While we chronicle so many changes to the Whig side, it is proper to notice the other side, whenever a change occurs, which is not often. In Kentucky, however, the Whigs have lately swapped off R. A. Wickliffe, for P. H. Pope, and threw in Henry Daniel to boot. We have the best of the bargain by great odds.—Cia. Gtz.

THE TIMES.

FAYETTE, MISSOURI, JULY 4, 1840.



ONE PRESIDENTIAL TERM—
Proposed by General Jackson—Disavowed by Van Buren—The People will establish it by the election of General Harrison.

—THE TRUE REPUBLICAN TICKET—

FOR PRESIDENT,

William Henry Harrison,

OF OHIO.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

John Tyler, of Va.

For Electors of President and Vice President of the United States,

PHILIP COLE, of Washington.

JOSEPH C. BROWN, of St. Louis.

SAMUEL C. OWENS, of Jackson.

STEPHEN CLEAVER, of Hills.

Nominations by the Whig Convention of Missouri, assembled in the City of Jefferson,

Monday, October 21st, 1839.

FOR GOVERNOR,

JOHN B. CLARK, of Howard County.

FOR DEPUTY GOVERNOR,

JOSEPH BOGY, of Ste. Genevieve.

FOR CONGRESS,

EDWARD M. SAMUEL, of Liberty.

GEORGE C. SIBLEY, of St. Charles.

WE are authorized to announce the names of the following gentlemen, as candidates for the next General Assembly, from this District and County, viz.

For the Senate—Joseph Coover.

For the House of Representatives—Henry W. King, Asariah R. Anderson, Thomas Jackson, and James H. Birch.

Having offered every thing that was fair in the way of honorable compromise, the friends of General Harrison now go to work in Howard, with a clear majority, an able and popular ticket, and men who will represent the interests of the County and the dignity of the State, regardless of its effect either upon other men or other parties.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Our friends must bear with us this week—we have no room, even for editorial comment. We have received an unusual number of communications from our best correspondents, and regret our inability to give them to our readers this week. Next week we will try and make room for some of them, at least.

We would call attention, to the advertisement in another column, giving notice of the examination of the Glasgow Literary Institution.

GEN. HARRISON'S SPEECH AT COLUMBUS.

We regret we cannot give this able publication this week. We shall issue extra's next week, containing this and his letter to Mr. Lyons, &c.

The last Democrat, is equally abusive and low, as the preceding number. Keep it up neighbor—the emetic works well.

The communication, accompanying the fine tooth comb, to be presented to the Editor of the Hickory Club, has been received, and the directions will be complied with, so soon as that notable being, who edits the "Chant" in question, can be ferreted out.

TO JOHN J. LOWRY,

President of the Branch Bank at Fayette.

Sir: I desire to call your attention to the 17th section of the Act chartering the Bank of Missouri. It is in these words:

17. No person holding any office of profit or trust under the government of the United States or of this State, shall be a director or officer of said bank.

Now, sir, will you be good enough to inform the public if the clear provision of this section has not been violated in your Bank, from the moment of its organization, in the person of Wm. M. Jackson, who holds the office of Magistrate in Monticello township, in Howard county. I know that at least one conscientious Whig declined the appointment of Director on this ground, expressly.

While I have my pen in hand, I will also call your attention to the 21st section, as follows:

21. All directors must be citizens of Missouri & none but stockholders shall be eligible as a director, except as a director on the part of the State, and no director in any other bank, or the partner in trade of such director, nor two persons trading in partnership at the same time, shall be eligible as directors.

In explanation of the above provision, will you be good enough to inform the public if two of the state directors have not been intimately connected as partners in trade for several months, and even up to this day.

THE STANDING ARMY.

Since the appearance of the last Times, Col. Birch has met Doctor Redman before an assembly of the citizens of Boone's Lick Township, to whom this great question was argued—hour and hour about. Dr. Redman did not deny, when called to do so by Col. B., that the published extracts from the Message and the Report were genuine—but defended the measure to the full extent of his ability—although he endeavored to screen Mr. Van Buren, as much as possible, by parading and reading the recent letter of Mr. Poinsett, to the Editor of the Richmond Enquirer, in which he certifies that the President had "NO PREVIOUS KNOWLEDGE OF ITS DETAILS," and that it was sent to Congress "without being previously submitted to the President."

This admission—this disgraceful "backing out"—this certificate of his own shame, by his own officer, in connection with the earnest recommendation of "the PLAN submitted by that officer," as already

quoted from his sworn message, seals the fate of Martin Van Buren with all honorable men. Let the man who promised to walk in the footsteps of Andrew Jackson, instead of standing by "the responsibility" he had assumed, procure the certificate of a Cabinet officer, whose bread was in his hands, that he had solemnly and strongly recommended to the consideration of Congress "a plan" of which he had "no previous knowledge!"

That Martin Van Buren was either false to the country, and false to his oath in the first place, or has procured his Secretary to certify a falsehood now, no rational man, with the constitution before him, can hesitate to decide. The verdict, therefore, of men who respect themselves, and have the least care for the interest of the country, cannot be doubtful after this shameful and cowardly perversion, by a man who has been honored to sit at the seat of Washington!

TO YOUR TENTS! O ISRAEL!!

You who are for converting the whole country into a military encampment of Presidential soldiers, in time of Peace—of killing its jills with citizens who may be unable to buy a gun, or march at his command, or in any respect contravene his pleasure, have but to sustain him and his MEN NOW.

READ, AND LEND TO YOUR NEIGHBOR.

The locus in "come it" in their desperate attempt to excuse Van Buren's Standing Army by reference to the course of General Harrison, forty years ago, in relation to the disbanding of the small army at that day. The letter of Messrs. Rives and Dringwood, which occupies so much space in the last Democrat, and which embodies an extract from General Harrison's speech in opposition to the measure is all answered, and more than answered by the subjoined facts from the N. Y. Express. Harrison (it will be seen by those who read his speech) puts his opposition to the measure mainly on the wishes of "nine tenths of his constituents," while Gen. Smith, and other prominent and distinguished republicans, took a much stronger ground. The attempt, therefore, either to set off Van Buren's bill of 1820, by Harrison's course in 1790—or to un-republicanize the "Democratic General" (as Richie used to call the Hero of the Thames) because he acted with such men as Samuel Smith, Willis Alston, and other patriots of the Jeffersonian party, will be as disastrous as the effort now in progress, to clear Mr. Van Buren of the responsibility of his own official "recommendation" by the certificate of Mr. Poinsett that he did not know what he was doing!

Read—From the New York Courier & Enquirer:

We too have a file of the Aurora of that day, which puts it in our power to supply some deficiencies in the account of the debate referred to, and some missing links in the chain of circumstances which it took place, and which are necessary to the right understanding of the matter.

The act for raising troops, &c. was passed at a time when this country was supposed by those who passed it to be on the eve of a war with France—Without pretending at this distance of time to measure very nearly the degree of necessity for this preparation for war (which was then justified on nearly the same ground as was the act of the last Congress placing ten millions of money, and all the Army, Navy, and Militia, at the disposal of the Executive in a similar supposed contingency. We are enabled to state, that under the authority above referred to, the number of troops actually raised, and in camp or garrison, at the time of the motion for a repeal of the act under which they were raised, was but three thousand, three hundred and ninety-nine—an amount of force not quite as dangerous, it must be admitted, were it to be kept standing forever, as if it had amounted to a hundred thousand men. We are enabled to state, further, that when this motion was made for disbanding this small force, the emergency upon which it was raised had not entirely passed away. Our differences with France were not adjusted. Negotiations had indeed been renewed at Paris between the Ministers of the two countries, but they were as far from a final termination as are (to the best of our knowledge) the negotiations now going on at London upon the same subject.

We are enabled to state, further, concerning which some persons have been so ready to rush into a war. We were still in a state of what was then called *quasi war*, with France. Under these circumstances the speech was made, of which the above is obviously a mere report—a mere skeleton, erroneous upon the face of it in some particulars, and possibly inaccurate in others. The sum of the speech is, that Gen. H. said he should not represent his constituents, the scattered and defenseless inhabitants of the central and northwestern Territory, embracing the present states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan, and the Territories of Wisconsin and Iowa, if he did not say that they would more readily bear their share of the expense of maintaining this force than that it should be abandoned. To this suggestion Gen. H. added some views of his own concerning the value of militia for garrison duty, &c. upon which he justly has since given practical demonstration of more value than whole tones of declamation, and upon which, besides, his recorded opinions of a much more recent date, and much better defined, are to be found spread upon the legislative annals of his country, and have been recently quoted in this paper and elsewhere.

The vote upon the above proposition was as stated, and the yeas and nays are correctly given in the subsequent part of the record. The yeas were 100, and the nays 100. But it was not a party question, and it is in drawing an inference opposite to this that the gentleman from Virginia have been led into an unfortunate error, which we think the facts do not bear them out.

The fact is, that several of the Republicans in Congress, along with General Harrison, opposed this resolution. General Harrison, being a delegate, could only speak against it. They voted against it, upon the ground taken by General Harrison, but also upon other ground taken by a distinguished member from Maryland, whose Republicanism the honorable members from Virginia will not, we presume, undertake to call in question, but whose speech, in the same file of the Aurora which they have quoted, appears wholly to have escaped their notice. Among the *nays* upon this proposition, we recognize the names of a number of distinguished members of the Republican party of that day, and among them the following: Willis Alston, George Dent, Benj. Huger, James Lynn, Josiah Parker, Samuel Smith, Benjamin Taliferro.

But what we particularly desire to draw the reader's attention to, is the speech of Gen. Samuel Smith, of Maryland, delivered in the debate upon the above resolution. He was an older soldier as well as an older man than Gen. Harrison, (and had been a vote against him.) He was speaking in full communion with the Democratic Republicans of that day, and up to the time of his death, which took place very recently, was recognized as one of the most orthodox among them. This speech, as we have already intimated, is a part of the debate which the speech of General Harrison, as above, has been picked out for the purpose of giving color to a charge of political heterodoxy against Gen. Harrison.

Gen. Smith said, among other things: "He conceived it necessary to call the recollection of gentlemen to the state of affairs when the law in question had passed. It had been thought proper by the Senate of the United States to publish the despatches of our envoys to France, which, by him, and many others, was considered in no other light than as a manifest to prepare the minds of the People for war, for all had declared that France could not otherwise do, after their publication, than declare war. The House thought so, and declined the publication on their part. However, having been made public, it became a duty to assume a

posture of defence; the necessity of which so strongly impressed him, that he could not have returned to his constituents without seeing the proper measures taken.

"It has been said that this part of the army was not a part of the system of defence. What also could be? To be sure, it was not the only means of defence adapted to it; it was considered that this army would operate valuably as a rallying point round which the militia would assemble; it was thought that wherever the U. S. was invaded, the enemy would first be met by the militia; and that these troops, being prepared, would rapidly come to their aid."

"Under these impressions, Mr. Smith said he had thought it his duty to bring forward a resolution for raising eight regiments, and six troops of dragoons; the House carried it further, and voted twelve regiments and the dragoons. The measure was then thought to be so essential a feature of our defence, that there were but eleven members who voted against it. It was recollected that a gentleman expressed an opinion that the right wing of the army of England (as it was then called) would probably come to this country (although he had no such idea); he had thought that the Southern States might be in danger of a descent from Hispaniola, and therefore that a small army might be necessary."

"It would not be considered improper for gentlemen to vote for continuing the men who had been recruited into the twelve regiments a few months longer, for although they could not be drafted into the old regiments, yet many of them might and probably would be recruited for those regiments, and a saving of clothing, &c. &c., would thereby be effected."

"Under this statement of facts, would gentlemen think of destroying this army at once? Would it not be more prudent to wait two or three months for advices from our envoys? He felt well assured in his own mind, that he would be the result of our negotiation. If gentlemen thought with him, they would wait the event. If successful, the army would of course be discharged under the law."

"The resolution, Mr. Smith said, was calculated to discharge all these men without a single shilling to carry them home. He trusted they would not be sent home without such provision as it had been said to make."

"This army had been called a standing army, and it was said that excess would be found to keep it, even after a peace. But this cannot happen, for the law expires whenever the differences between France and America are made up."

"Sir, said Mr. Smith, there is no man that places more reliance on the militia than I do; but, before I place all my reliance on that truly essential part of our defence, much as I admire it, I must see a better militia law framed than exists at present. Until that time, I must say that a regular army, in case of war, will be always deemed necessary."

"The truth being that there are not more men recruited for the new regiments than would fill the permanent army, of course an extraordinary expense beyond the usual estimated expenses of the army except that of the officers of the thirteen regiments, the amount of which was not such as in his opinion ought to induce a conduct that would have but too much the appearance of verbiage in our Government—he should therefore vote against the motion, under a firm reliance that there: nothing service would be stopped immediately."

From the Stockholder.

Our Randolph correspondent must excuse us. We cannot even conceive of any concurrence of causes which would enable us to justify it to our self respect to permit our columns to be made even the medium of a controversy with the abandoned conductors of the Hickory Club. The Address of the Central Committee of Kentucky, which we publish to-day, will show their character, when it is remembered that the same false and deceptive narrative which it exposes in reference to the circular letter and the Cheviot speech of General Harrison, has been the very basis of its reliance and of that of the Democrat, to prove the gallant assertion of the rights of Missouri an Abolitionist! No earthly consideration could induce an honorable man, or set of men, thus to expose themselves, forever, to the indignant distrust of every manly minded citizen. But that is for them—and the people.

The last number, however, contains an official statement—marked "A," procured by Col. Benton and made the basis of his speech, in which he essays to defend the administration against the charge of extravagance. And what does Col. Benton's classified "statement" make out to have been the "aggregate amount for permanent and ordinary purposes, excluding payments on account of objects either extraordinary or temporary?" Read the 3d column of statement "A," as published in the Democrat and Club, and it will be seen that in the year 1835, the first year of the extravagant administration of J. Q. Adams, these "permanent and ordinary" expenditures amounted to \$2,537,671 27, while in the same first year of the economical administration of Martin Van Buren, these same "permanent and ordinary" expenditures have amounted up to \$13,093,321 83. These being the "permanent and ordinary" expenses, thus proved by Col. Benton, his whole speech concerning the extraordinary portion of the 39 millions which the Whigs charge on the administration amounts in Congress may go for nothing, until it be explained how it was that Jefferson, who came in as a reformer, did actually retrench the government expenditures, in the average sum of nearly \$200,000 yearly, during his whole eight years, notwithstanding the population of the country and the expense of new States, and a new apportionment of representation in Congress grew on his hands, and as a charge on his treasury, the same as it has on the present economical and democratic! Chief Magistrate. In proof of this, Col. Birch read the following statements:

"The sum, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as 'ordinary'—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

Recapitulation of Expenses.
John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

Recapitulation of Expenses.
John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

Recapitulation of Expenses.
John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

Recapitulation of Expenses.
John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

Recapitulation of Expenses.
John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

Recapitulation of Expenses.
John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

Recapitulation of Expenses.
John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

Recapitulation of Expenses.
John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

Recapitulation of Expenses.
John Adams' 4 years, 621,450,359 10
Average for each year, \$5,392,587 70
Thos. Jefferson's 8 years, 841,300,788 68
Average for each year, \$5,166,289 55.

These sums, the reader will remark, included all the expenses of John Adams and Jefferson—extraordinary as well as "ordinary"—but the principle is the same. Mr. Jefferson, and the true democracy of that day, complained of the prodigality of the administration of Mr. Adams, and promised retrenchment and reform. They succeeded in the elections and kept their promise. Mr. Van Buren and his old federal associates, who have stolen the name of the Democratic party while tramping in the dust all its principles, promised equally fair: if the people would trust them—and lo! they have reduced the whole expenditures,* which in Mr. Adams' first year amounted to

From the Stockholder.

Our Randolph correspondent must excuse us. We cannot even conceive of any concurrence of causes which would enable us to justify it to our self respect to permit our columns to be made even the medium of a controversy with the abandoned conductors of the Hickory Club. The Address of the Central Committee of Kentucky, which we publish to-day, will show their character, when it is remembered that the same false and deceptive narrative which it exposes in reference to the circular letter and the Cheviot speech of General Harrison, has been the very basis of its reliance and of that of the Democrat, to prove the gallant assertion of the rights of Missouri an Abolitionist! No earthly consideration could induce an honorable man, or set of men, thus to expose themselves, forever, to the indignant distrust of every manly minded citizen. But that is for them—and the people.

The last number, however, contains an official statement—marked "A," procured by Col. Benton and made the basis of his speech, in which he essays to defend the administration against the charge of extravagance. And what does Col. Benton's classified "statement" make out to have been the "aggregate amount for permanent and ordinary purposes, excluding payments on account of objects either extraordinary or temporary?" Read the 3d column of statement "A," as published in the Democrat and Club, and it will be seen that in the year 1835, the first year of the extravagant administration of J. Q. Adams, these "permanent and ordinary" expenditures amounted to \$2,537,671 27, while in the same first year of the economical administration of Martin Van Buren, these same "permanent and ordinary" expenditures have amounted up to \$13,093,321 83. These being the "permanent and ordinary" expenses, thus proved by Col. Benton, his whole speech concerning the extraordinary portion of the 39 millions which the Whigs charge on the administration amounts in Congress may go for nothing, until it be explained how it was that Jefferson, who came in as a reformer, did actually retrench the government expenditures, in the average sum of nearly \$200,000 yearly, during his whole eight years, notwithstanding the population of the country and the expense of new States, and a new apportionment of representation in Congress grew on his hands, and as a charge on his treasury, the same as it has on the present economical and democratic! Chief Magistrate. In proof of this, Col. Birch read the following statements:

"The